Dynamic Control of Agents playing Aggregative Games

Sergio Grammatico

arXiv:1609.08962v1 [math.OC] 28 Sep 2016

Abstract

We address the problem to control a population of noncooperative heterogeneous agents, each with strongly convex cost function depending on the average population state, and all sharing a convex constraint, towards a competitive aggregative equilibrium. We assume an information structure through which a central controller has access to the average population state and can broadcast control signals for steering the decentralized optimal responses of the agents. We propose a dynamic control law that, based on monotone operator theory arguments, ensures global convergence to an equilibrium independently on the problem data, that are the cost functions and the constraints, local and global, of the agents. We illustrate the proposed method in two application domains: demand side management and network congestion control.

I. Introduction

Motivation: The problem to coordinate a population of competitive agents arises in several application domains such as the demand side management in the smart grid [1], [2], [3], [4], [5], [6], e.g. for thermostatically controlled loads [7] and plug-in electric vehicles [8], [9], [10], [11], demand response in competitive markets [12], congestion control for networks with shared resources [13].

The typical challenge in such coordination problems is that the agents are noncooperative, self-interested, yet coupled together, and have local decision authority that if left uncontrolled can lead to undesired emerging population behavior. From the control-theoretic perspective, the objective is to design a control law for steering the strategies of the agents towards a noncooperative game equilibrium [14], [15].

S. Grammatico is with the Control Systems group, Department of Electrical Engineering, Eindhoven University of Technology, The Netherlands. E-mail address: s.grammatico@tue.nl.

Related literature: Whenever the behavior of each agent is affected by some aggregate effect of all the agents, which is a typical feature of the mentioned application domains, rather than by agent-specific one-to-one effects, *aggregative games* [16], [17], [18], [19] offer the fundamentals to analyze the strategic interactions between each individual agent and the entire population, although in the classic literature the analysis is limited to agents with scalar decision variable.

For large, in fact infinite, population size, aggregative game setups have been considered as *mean field* games among agents with *quadratic* cost functions and *unconstrained* vector decision variable, both in the deterministic [20] and in the stochastic case [21]. Unlike classic aggregative and mean field games, in this paper we are interested in generalized aggregative games for a large population of agents with general *convex* functions, *constrained* vector decision variable [22], [23], and in addition with convex *shared* (i.e., *coupling*) *constraints*.

Generalized games, that is, games among agents with shared constraints [24], [25], have been widely studied in the last decade within the operations research community [26], [27] and the control systems one [28], [29], [30], [31] in relation with duality theory and variational inequalities.

Assessing the convergence of the dynamic interactions among the noncooperative agents towards an equilibrium is one main challenge that arises in (generalized) games. With this aim, best response dynamics and fictitious play with inertia, i.e., gradient update dynamics, have been analyzed and designed, respectively, both in discrete [32], [33] and continuous time setups [34], [35]. In particular, fictitious play with inertia has been introduced to overcome the typical non-convergence issue of the best response dynamics [34]. The common feature of these methods is that the agents dynamically implement sufficiently small gradient-type steps, each along the direction of optimality for their local problem. Thus, the *noncooperative* agents need to agree on the sequence of step sizes, and in addition to exchange truthful information, e.g. with neighboring players, to update their local descent directions. Several distributed algorithms have been proposed for computing the game equilibria, see [36], [37], [38], [39], [40] and the references therein.

Originality: Differently from distributed approaches, in this paper we consider aggregative games among noncooperative agents that do not exchange information, nor agree on variables affecting their local behavior, with the other (competing) agents. Along the lines in [10], [23], we assume the presence of a central controller that coordinates the decentralized optimal responses of



Fig. 1: Semi-dentralized control architecture. The controller κ can broadcast to all the agents incentive signals that are designed based on the average among their decentralized optimal responses $(x^{i\star})_{i=1}^{N}$.

the competitive agents, via the broadcast of incentive signals common to all of them. Specifically, we design a dynamic control law computing incentives that linearly affect the cost functions of all the agents, only based on the *average* among their decentralized optimal responses. The resulting information structure determines the semi-decentralized control architecture illustrated in Figure 1.

For large population size, we wish to control the decentralized optimal responses of the agents towards a competitive aggregative equilibrium, that is, a set of agent strategies that are feasible for both the local and the shared constraints, and individually optimal for each agent, given the strategies of all other agents and some *penalty* signal associated with the shared constraint.

We aim at a competitive equilibrium rather than a Nash equilibrium since in several classes of generalized games the former is more efficient than the latter, in the sense that the (clearing) price associated with the shared constraints at the Nash equilibrium is higher than that at the competitive equilibrium, as well as the total disutility [12, Theorem 5].

Contribution: The main contributions of the paper are summarized next.

- We address the general problem to control a population of competitive agents with convex

cost functions and constraints coupled together in aggregative form.

- We show that the agents' decentralized optimal responses to their average gets arbitrarily close to a competitive equilibrium as the population size grows.
- We discover a nontrivial multivariable mapping with the following two fundamental properties:
  1. its unique zero is the incentive signal that generates, via the agents' decentralized optimal responses, the desired equilibrium;
  2. there exists a Hilbert space in which the mapping reads as the sum of two monotone operators.

  Therefore, splitting methods are applicable for computing the zero of such mapping in a semi-decentralized fashion.
- We design a dynamic control law with global convergence guarantee for steering the agents' decentralized optimal responses to the desired equilibrium, with minimal information structure, and with no assumption on the problem data, other than strong convexity.
- We apply our approach to congestion control in shared networks and demand side management in the smart grid, generalizing the literature results.

For establishing global convergence with minimal information structure, we build upon mathematical tools from variational and convex analysis [41], and monotone operator theory [42]. Technically, we go beyond the literature results, where the cost functions are assumed to be strongly convex quadratic and/or there is no coupling constraint [22], [23]. Preliminary versions of some technical results in this paper are in [43], [44]. Specifically, in [43] no coupling constraint is considered, while in [44] the cost functions are assumed to be strongly convex quadratic. In addition, the class of control laws proposed therein are different from that in this paper; the latter allow us to postulate no assumption on the problem data, other than strong convexity. Also, applications are not illustrated in [43], [44].

Paper organization: Sections II, III define the aggregative game, the competitive equilibrium and its approximation with an appropriate fixed point. Section IV presents the novel dynamic control law. The main technical results are shown in Section V and discussed in Section VI. Section VII illustrates the proposed approach via numerical simulations. Section VIII concludes the paper and points at several research opportunities. Some proofs are provided in the Appendix.

Basic notation: $\mathbb{R}$, $\mathbb{R}_{>0}$, $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ respectively denote the set of real, positive, and non-negative real numbers; $\overline{\mathbb{R}} := \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}$; $\mathbb{N}$ denotes the set of natural numbers; for $a, b \in \mathbb{N}$, $a \leq b$, $\mathbb{N}[a,b] := [a,b] \cap \mathbb{N}$. $A^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ denotes the transpose of $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$. Given vectors $x_1, \ldots, x_T \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $[x_1; \ldots; x_T] \in \mathbb{R}^{nT}$ denotes $\left[x_1^\top, \cdots, x_T^\top\right]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{nT}$. Given matrices $A_1, \ldots, A_M$, $\operatorname{diag}(A_1, \ldots, A_M)$ denotes the block diagonal matrix with $A_1, \ldots, A_M$ in block diagonal positions; given scalars $a_1, \ldots, a_M$, we use the notation $\operatorname{vec}\left((a_i)_{i=1}^M\right) := [a_1, \ldots, a_M]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^M$. With $\mathbb{S}^n$ we denote the set of symmetric $n \times n$ matrices; for a given $Q \in \mathbb{S}^n$, the notations $Q \succ 0$ ($Q \succcurlyeq 0$) and $Q \in \mathbb{S}^n_{\succ 0}$ ($Q \in \mathbb{S}^n_{\succcurlyeq 0}$) denote that Q is symmetric and has positive (non-negative) eigenvalues. I denotes the identity matrix; $\mathbf{0}$ ($\mathbf{1}$) denotes a matrix/vector with all elements equal to 0 (1); to improve clarity, we may add the dimension of these matrices/vectors as subscript. $A \otimes B$ denotes the Kronecker product between matrices A and B. Every mentioned set $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ is meant to be nonempty. Given $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$, $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ and $b \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $A\mathcal{S} + b$ denotes the set $\{Ax + b \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid x \in \mathcal{S}\}$; hence $\frac{1}{N}(\sum_{i=1}^N \mathcal{S}^i) := \{\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^N x^i \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid x^i \in \mathcal{S}^i \ \forall i \in \mathbb{N}[1,N]\}$. $\varepsilon_N = \mathcal{O}(1/N)$ denotes that $\exists\, c > 0$ such that $\lim_{N\to\infty} N\,\varepsilon_N = c$.

Operator theory notations and definitions: $\mathcal{H}_Q$, with $Q \in \mathbb{S}^n_{\succ 0}$, denotes the Hilbert space $\mathbb{R}^n$ with inner product $\langle x, y\rangle_Q := x^\top Q y$ and induced norm $\|x\|_Q := \sqrt{x^\top Q x}$, for all $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n$; we refer to the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_I$ whenever not specified otherwise. Given a function $f : \mathbb{R}^n \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$, $\operatorname{dom}(f) := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid f(x) < \infty\}$. $f : \mathbb{R}^n \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ is ℓ-*strongly convex*, where $\ell \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$, if $f(\cdot) - \frac{1}{2}\ell\,\|\cdot\|^2$ is convex. $\mathrm{Id} : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^n$ denotes the identity operator. A mapping $f : \mathbb{R}^n \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}^n$ is ℓ-Lipschitz continuous relative to $\mathcal{H}_Q$, where $\ell \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$, if $\|f(x) - f(y)\|_Q \leq \ell\,\|x - y\|_Q$ for all $x, y \in \operatorname{dom}(f)$; f is a contraction (nonexpansive) mapping in $\mathcal{H}_Q$ if it is ℓ-Lipschitz relative to $\mathcal{H}_Q$ with $\ell \in [0,1)$ ($\ell \in [0,1]$). Given a function $f : \mathbb{R}^n \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$, $\partial f : \operatorname{dom}(f) \rightrightarrows \mathbb{R}^n$ denotes its subdifferential set-valued mapping [41], defined as $\partial f(x) := \{v \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid f(z) \geq f(x) + v^\top(z - x) \text{ for all } z \in \operatorname{dom}(f)\}$. A mapping $f : \mathbb{R}^n \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}^n$ is (strictly) *monotone* in $\mathcal{H}_Q$ if $(f(x) - f(y))^\top Q\,(x - y) \geq 0\,(> 0)$ for all $x \neq y \in \operatorname{dom}(f)$; it is ℓ-*strongly monotone*, where $\ell \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$, $\mathcal{H}_Q$ if $(f(x) - f(y))^\top Q\,(x - y) \geq \ell\,\|x - y\|_Q^2$ for all $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n$; it is *firmly nonexpansive* (hence monotone and nonexpansive) if $(f(x) - f(y))^\top P(x - y) \geq \|f(x) - f(y)\|^2$ for all $x, y \in \operatorname{dom}(f)$ [23, Lemma 5]; it is β-*cocoercive* (hence monotone), where $\beta \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$, if the mapping $\beta\, f(\cdot)$ is firmly nonexpansive.

II. THE COMPETITIVE AGGREGATIVE GAME

We consider a population of $N \gg 1$ competitive agents, where each agent $i \in \mathbb{N}[1, N]$ has strategy (i.e., decision variable) $x^i \in \mathcal{X}^i \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, and all share the constraint

$$\tfrac{1}{N} \textstyle\sum_{i=1}^N x^i \in \mathcal{S}, \tag{1}$$

for some set $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathcal{X}^i \subset \mathbb{R}^n$.

We assume that each agent $i \in \mathbb{N}[1, N]$ aims at minimizing its local cost function, which depends on the average among the strategies of all other agents, and specifically at computing

$$x^i \in \arg\min_{y \in \mathcal{X}^i} J^i \left(y, \tfrac{1}{N} \left(y + \textstyle\sum_{j \neq i}^N x^j \right) \right) + p^\top y, \tag{2}$$

where the vector $p \in \mathbb{R}^n$ represents the penalty associated with the coupling constraint in (1). Formally, x^i in (2) is a *best response* of agent i to the strategies of the other agents, given the penalty vector p.

Throughout the paper, we assume compactness, convexity [23, Section III-A] and Slater's qualification [45, Proposition 3.3.9] of both the individual and the shared constraints, and strong convexity of the cost functions, with linear dependence on the global coupling variable. Such basic assumptions ensure existence of a game equilibrium, and that the agents' optimal responses, defined later on in Section III, are single-valued and continuous.

Standing Assumption 1: Compactness, convexity, Slater's qualification. The sets $\{\mathcal{X}^i\}_{i=1}^N$ and $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathcal{X}^i$ are compact and convex subsets of $\mathbb{R}^n$, and satisfy the Slater's constraint qualification. There exists a compact set $\mathcal{X} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ such that $\cup_{i=1}^N \mathcal{X}^i \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ for all $N \geq 0$. □

Standing Assumption 2: Strongly convex cost functions. For all $i \in \mathbb{N}[1, N]$, the cost function $J^i : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ in (2) is defined as

$$J^i(y, \sigma) := f^i(y) + (C\sigma)^\top y, \tag{3}$$

for some $f^i : \mathbb{R}^n \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ continuous and ℓ-strongly convex on $\mathrm{dom}(f^i) \subseteq \mathcal{X}^i$, $\ell \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$, and $C \in \mathbb{S}^n$. □

Remark 1: It follows from the fact that $\mathrm{dom}(f^i) \subseteq \mathcal{X}^i$, i.e., $f^i(x) := \infty$ for all $x \in (\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \mathcal{X}^i)$ that, for all $\sigma \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $\arg\min_{y \in \mathcal{X}^i} J^i(y, \sigma) = \arg\min_{y \in \mathbb{R}^n} J^i(y, \sigma)$. □

Our goal is to control the strategies of the agents within a competitive aggregative equilibrium, that is, a set of strategies and penalty vector such that: the coupling constraint in (1) is satisfied,

and each agent's strategy is optimal given the penalty vector and the strategies of all other agents, see [12, Definition 1] for a definition of competitive equilibrium with linear coupling constraints.

Definition 1: Competitive aggregative equilibrium. A pair $\left((\bar{x}^i)_{i=1}^N,\, \bar{p}\right)$ is a competitive aggregative ε-equilibrium, $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, for the game in (2) with shared constraint in (1) if $\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^N \bar{x}^i \in \mathcal{S}$, for all $i \in \mathbb{N}[1,N]$, $\bar{x}^i \in \mathcal{X}^i$ and

$$J^i\left(\bar{x}^i, \tfrac{1}{N}\sum_{j=1}^N \bar{x}^j\right) + \bar{p}^\top \bar{x}^i \leq \inf_{y\in\mathcal{X}^i} J^i\left(y, \tfrac{1}{N}\left(y + \sum_{j\neq i}^N \bar{x}^j\right)\right) + \bar{p}^\top y + \varepsilon. \tag{4}$$

It is a competitive aggregative equilibrium for the game in (2) with shared constraint in (1) if $\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^N \bar{x}^i \in \mathcal{S}$ and, for all $i \in \mathbb{N}[1,N]$, $\bar{x}^i \in \mathcal{X}^i$ and (4) holds with $\varepsilon = 0$. □

Proposition 1: Existence of a competitive aggregative equilibrium. There exists a competitive aggregative equilibrium for the game in (2) with shared constraint in (1). □

Proof: See Appendix A. ■

III. Fixed points of the aggregation mapping

Differently from typical game theoretic setups, we assume that an agent i cannot exchange information on the strategies of all other (competing) agents, which challenges the computation of an equilibrium especially for large population size. Instead, we assume that each individual agent responds optimally to incentive signals $(\sigma, \lambda) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n$ that enter as second argument of the cost functions in (3) and as penalty vector, respectively, according to the information structure in Figure 1. Formally, for all $i \in \mathbb{N}[1,N]$, we define the agent's *optimal response* mapping $x^{i\star} : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathcal{X}^i$ as

$$\begin{aligned} x^{i\star}(\sigma,\lambda) &:= \arg\min_{y\in\mathcal{X}^i}\; J^i(y,\sigma) + \lambda^\top y \\ &= \arg\min_{y\in\mathcal{X}^i}\; f^i(y) + (C\,\sigma + \lambda)^\top y, \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

and the aggregation mapping $\mathcal{A} : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \to \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^N \mathcal{X}^i$ as

$$\mathcal{A}(\sigma,\lambda) := \tfrac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^N x^{i\star}(\sigma,\lambda). \tag{6}$$

Then we note that, if $\bar{\sigma} = \mathcal{A}\left(\bar{\sigma}, \bar{\lambda}\right)$ for some $\bar{\lambda} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, and we introduce the shorthand notation $\bar{x}^i := x^{i\star}(\bar{\sigma}, \bar{\lambda})$, then $\bar{\sigma} = \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^N \bar{x}^i$ is the second argument of J^i in the left-hand side of (4), and an $\mathcal{O}(1/N)$ approximation of the second argument of J^i in the right-hand side of (4). Thus, let us formalize next that a pair $\left((\bar{x}^i)_{i=1}^N,\, \bar{\lambda}\right)$ is in fact a competitive aggregative ε-equilibrium.

Proposition 2: Existence of a fixed point. There exists $(\bar{\sigma}, \bar{\lambda}) \in (\mathcal{S} \times \mathbb{R}^n)$ such that $\bar{\sigma} \in \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N} \mathcal{X}^i$ is a fixed point of $\mathcal{A}\left(\cdot, \bar{\lambda}\right)$ in (6), i.e., $\mathcal{A}\left(\bar{\sigma}, \bar{\lambda}\right) = \bar{\sigma}$. □

Proof: See Appendix B. ■

Theorem 1: Fixed point generates a competitive aggregative ε-equilibrium. If $(\bar{\sigma}, \bar{\lambda}) \in (\mathcal{S} \times \mathbb{R}^n)$ is such that $\bar{\sigma} = \mathcal{A}\left(\bar{\sigma}, \bar{\lambda}\right)$ as defined in (6), then the pair $\left((x^{i\star}(\bar{\sigma}, \bar{\lambda}))_{i=1}^{N}, \bar{\lambda}\right)$, with $x^{i\star}$ as in (5) for all $i \in \mathbb{N}[1, N]$, is a competitive aggregative ε_N-equilibrium for the game in (2) with shared constraint in (1), where $\lim_{N\to\infty} \varepsilon_N = 0$; in addition, if the functions $\{f^i\}_{i=1}^{N}$ in (3) are ℓ-Lipschitz continuous for some $\ell \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$, then $\varepsilon_N = \mathcal{O}(1/N)$. □

Proof: See Appendix C. ■

Theorem 1 states that, in the limit of infinite population size, a competitive aggregative equilibrium is generated by the agents' optimal responses to any pair $(\bar{\sigma}, \bar{\lambda})$ such that $\bar{\sigma}$ is a fixed point of $\mathcal{A}\left(\cdot, \bar{\lambda}\right)$ in $\mathcal{S}$.

IV. Dynamic control of the decentralized optimal responses

In view of Theorem 1, for large population size we can control the agents' optimal responses, e.g. via dynamic updates of their two arguments, to a set of strategies whose average is a fixed point of the aggregation mapping (with respect to the first argument) within the shared constraint set. Informally speaking, the objective is to find a pair of arguments $(\bar{\sigma}, \bar{\lambda})$ such that $\bar{\sigma} = \mathcal{A}(\bar{\sigma}, \bar{\lambda}) = x^0$, for some $x^0 \in \mathcal{S}$. With this aim, in this section we translate the problem into that of finding a zero of an appropriate multivariable mapping via semi-decentralized iterations.

A. From fixed points to zeros

We start by defining the mapping $x^{0\star} : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathcal{S}$ as

$$x^{0\star}(\sigma, \lambda) := \operatorname*{arg\,min}_{y \in \mathcal{S}} \tfrac{1}{2} y^\top y + \left(K(\sigma - \lambda)\right)^\top y. \tag{7}$$

In this way, a pair $\left(\bar{\sigma}, \bar{\lambda}\right) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n$ satisfies $\bar{\sigma} = \mathcal{A}\left(\bar{\sigma}, \bar{\lambda}\right) = x^{0\star}(\bar{\sigma}, \bar{\lambda}) \in \mathcal{S}$ if and only if

$\left[\bar{\sigma}; \bar{\lambda}\right] \in \mathbb{R}^{2n}$ is a zero of the mapping $\Theta : \mathbb{R}^{2n} \to \mathbb{R}^{2n}$ defined as

$$\begin{aligned}\Theta\left(\begin{bmatrix}\sigma\\ \lambda\end{bmatrix}\right) &:= \begin{bmatrix}\sigma - \mathcal{A}(\sigma, K\lambda)\\ \sigma - 2\mathcal{A}(\sigma, K\lambda) + x^{0\star}(\sigma, \lambda)\end{bmatrix}\\ &= \begin{bmatrix}I_n & 0\\ I_n & 0\end{bmatrix}\begin{bmatrix}\sigma\\ \lambda\end{bmatrix} - \begin{bmatrix}\mathcal{A}(\sigma, K\lambda)\\ 2\mathcal{A}(\sigma, K\lambda) - x^{0\star}(\sigma, \lambda)\end{bmatrix}\\ &=: (M + \Gamma)\left(\begin{bmatrix}\sigma\\ \lambda\end{bmatrix}\right)\end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

where $K \succ 0$ is a matrix gain to be chosen, and we defined the matrix $M \in \mathbb{R}^{2n\times 2n}$ and the mapping $\Gamma : \mathbb{R}^{2n} \to \mathbb{R}^{2n}$ as

$$M := \begin{bmatrix}I_n & 0\\ I_n & 0\end{bmatrix}, \ \Gamma\left(\begin{bmatrix}\sigma\\ \lambda\end{bmatrix}\right) := -\begin{bmatrix}\mathcal{A}(\sigma, K\lambda)\\ 2\mathcal{A}(\sigma, K\lambda) - x^{0\star}(\sigma, \lambda)\end{bmatrix}. \tag{9}$$

B. Dynamic control as zero finding algorithm

In general, computing a zero of a multivariable nonlinear mapping such as $\Theta = M + \Gamma$ in (8) is a challenging task. However, for the sum of monotone mappings there exist iterative algorithms with global convergence guarantee [42, Chapter 25]. Inspired by the forward-backward algorithm [42, Equation 25.26], we propose the dynamic control law κ in $(*)$ for computing a zero of $\Theta = M + \Gamma$ in (8).

$$\begin{bmatrix}\sigma_{(t+1)}\\ \lambda_{(t+1)}\end{bmatrix} = \kappa\left(t, \begin{bmatrix}\sigma_{(t)}\\ \lambda_{(t)}\end{bmatrix}\right) := (1-\alpha_t)\begin{bmatrix}\sigma_{(t)}\\ \lambda_{(t)}\end{bmatrix} + \alpha_t\left(I + \epsilon M\right)^{-1}\left(\begin{bmatrix}\sigma_{(t)}\\ \lambda_{(t)}\end{bmatrix} - \epsilon\,\Gamma\left(\begin{bmatrix}\sigma_{(t)}\\ \lambda_{(t)}\end{bmatrix}\right)\right) \tag{$*$}$$

In $(*)$, $\epsilon > 0$ is sufficiently small and the sequence $(\alpha_t)_{t=0}^{\infty}$ is chosen as follows.

Design choice 1: The sequence $(\alpha_t)_{t=0}^{\infty}$ in $(*)$ is such that $\alpha_t \in (0, 3/2)$ for all $t \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \alpha_t\left(\frac{3}{2} - \alpha_t\right) = \infty$. □

Note that $\alpha_t = \bar{\alpha} \in (0, 3/2)$, and $\alpha_t = \bar{\alpha}/(t+1)$, for all $t \in \mathbb{N}$, satisfy the design condition stated above. Let us summarize the dynamic control scheme in Algorithm 1.

Algorithm 1: Dynamic control of competitive optimal responses

`Initialization`: $t \leftarrow 0$;

- The controller chooses $(\sigma_{(0)},\, \lambda_{(0)}) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathbb{R}^n$.

`Iterate until convergence`:

- The controller broadcasts

$$\left[\sigma_{(t)};\, K\lambda_{(t)}\right]$$

to all agents, and computes $x^{0\star}\left(\sigma_{(t)}, \lambda_{(t)}\right)$ from (7).

- The agents compute in parallel $x^{i\star}\left(\sigma_{(k)}, K\lambda_{(t)}\right)$ from (5), for all $i \in \mathbb{N}[1, N]$.
- The controller receives $\mathcal{A}\left(\sigma_{(t)}, K\lambda_{(t)}\right)$ as in (6), computes $\Gamma\left([\sigma_{(t)};\, \lambda_{(t)}]\right)$ from (9), and from $(*)$

$$\left[\sigma_{(t+1)};\, \lambda_{(t+1)}\right] = \kappa\left(t,\, \left[\sigma_{(t)};\, \lambda_{(t)}\right]\right).$$

$t \leftarrow t + 1$.

V. Global convergence

A. Statement of the main results

The mapping Θ in (8) reads as the sum of the linear, hence continuous, mapping M and the mapping Γ in (9). With the aim of applying [42, Theorem 25.8], in the following we show that by choosing the matrix gain K in (5) appropriately, M is monotone and Γ is β-cocoercive, that is, $\beta\,\Gamma(\cdot)$ is firmly nonexpansive, in some Hilbert space. Consequently, we derive a dynamic control law that ensures global convergence of the controlled decentralized optimal responses to a set of strategies whose average is a fixed point of the aggregation mapping with respect to its first argument, as desired.

Design choice 2: $K \in \mathbb{S}^n_{\succ 0}$ in (8) is chosen such that $C + K \succ 0$. □

Theorem 2: Monotonicity. Under design choice 2, the linear mapping M in (9) is monotone in $\mathcal{H}_P$, and the mapping Γ in (9) is β-cocoercive and strictly monotone in $\mathcal{H}_P$, where

$$P := \begin{bmatrix} C + 2K & -K \\ -K & K \end{bmatrix} \succ 0, \quad \beta := \frac{\ell}{6\,\|P\|} > 0. \tag{10}$$

□

Proposition 3: Existence and uniqueness. Under design choice 2, $\exists!\,(\bar{\sigma},\bar{\lambda}) \in \mathcal{S}\times\mathbb{R}^n$ such that $\Theta\left([\bar{\sigma};\bar{\lambda}]\right)=\mathbf{0}_{2n}$, with Θ as in (8). □

Proof: Existence follows from Proposition 2. Θ is the sum of monotone and strictly monotone mappings by Theorem 2, hence strictly monotone in $\mathcal{H}_P$ [41, Exercise 12.4 (c)], with P in (10). Thus uniqueness holds [42, Proposition 23.35]. ■

Design choice 3: The constant ϵ in $(*)$ is such that $\epsilon\in(0,\beta)$, with β in (10). □

Theorem 3: Global convergence. Under design choices 1–3, the sequence $\left(\sigma_{(t)},\lambda_{(t)}\right)_{t=0}^{\infty}$ defined in $(*)$ converges, for any initial condition, to a zero of Θ in (8), with $\mathcal{A}$ as in (6) and $x^{i\star}$ as in (5) for all $i\in\mathbb{N}[1,N]$. □

Proof: The assumptions of [42, Theorem 25.8 ($A:=M \Rightarrow J_{\epsilon A}=(I+\epsilon M)^{-1}$)] are verified as follows. M is continuous and monotone in $\mathcal{H}_P$ due to Theorem 2, hence maximally monotone [42, Corollary 20.25]. $\Gamma(\cdot)$ in (9) is β-cocoercive in $\mathcal{H}_P$ according to Theorem 2. The sequence $(\alpha_t)_{t=0}^{\infty}$ is chosen as in [42, Theorem 25.8 ($\gamma\leq\beta$)], and the existence of a zero of Θ holds by Proposition 3. ■

Corollary 1: Global convergence to a competitive aggregative ε-equilibrium. Under design choices 1–3, the sequence $\left((x^{i\star}(\sigma_{(t)},K\lambda_{(t)}))_{i=1}^{N},\,K\lambda_{(t)}\right)_{t=0}^{\infty}$ defined from (5), $(*)$ converges, for any initial condition, to a competitive aggregative ε_N-equilibrium of the game in (2) with shared constraint in (1), with $\lim_{N\to\infty}\varepsilon_N=0$. In addition, if the functions $\{f^i\}_{i=1}^N$ in (3) are ℓ-Lipschitz continuous for some $\ell\in\mathbb{R}_{>0}$, then $\varepsilon_N=\mathcal{O}(1/N)$. □

Proof: It follows from Theorems 1–3. ■

B. Proof of Theorem 2

First, M in (9) is monotone in $\mathcal{H}_P$ as [23, Lemma 3]

$$\begin{bmatrix} I & \mathbf{0}\\ I & \mathbf{0}\end{bmatrix}^{\top}\begin{bmatrix} C+2K & -K\\ -K & K\end{bmatrix}+\begin{bmatrix} C+2K & -K\\ -K & K\end{bmatrix}\begin{bmatrix} I & \mathbf{0}\\ I & \mathbf{0}\end{bmatrix}\succcurlyeq 0.$$

We proceed with two statements that are exploited later on.

Lemma 1: If a function $f:\mathbb{R}^n\to\overline{\mathbb{R}}$ is ℓ-strongly convex, $\ell\in\mathbb{R}_{>0}$, then: ∂f is ℓ-strongly monotone, and $(\partial f)^{-1}$ is everywhere single-valued, globally $(1/\ell)$-Lipschitz continuous, ℓ-cocoercive, and strictly monotone. □

Proof: ∂f is ℓ-strongly monotone by [41, Exercise 12.59], and equivalently $(\partial f)^{-1}$ is ℓ-cocoercive [46, p. 1021, Equation (18)]. $(\partial f)^{-1}$ is everywhere single-valued, globally $(1/\ell)$-Lipschitz continuous by [41, Proposition 12.54]. Finally, we show that $(\partial f)^{-1}$ is strictly monotone. For all $\xi, \zeta \in \operatorname{dom}(\partial f)$ such that $\xi \neq \zeta$, we have $(v-w)^\top(\xi-\zeta) \geq \ell \|\xi-\zeta\|^2 > 0$ for all $v \in \partial f(\xi)$, $w \in \partial f(\zeta)$. In particular, since $(\partial f)^{-1}$ is everywhere single-valued, for all $x, y \in \operatorname{rge}(\partial f) = \operatorname{dom}((\partial f)^{-1})$ there exist $\xi = (\partial f)^{-1}(x)$, $\zeta = (\partial f)^{-1}(y)$, such that $x \in \partial f(\xi)$, $y \in \partial f(\zeta)$, and hence $(x-y)^\top \left((\partial f)^{-1}(x) - (\partial f)^{-1}(y)\right) \geq \ell \|\xi-\zeta\|^2 > 0$. ■

Lemma 2: Let the function $f : \mathbb{R}^n \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ be ℓ-strongly convex, $\ell \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$. Then for any $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times m}$, the mapping

$$x^\star(\cdot) := \operatorname*{arg\,min}_{y\in\mathbb{R}^n} f(y) + (A\,\cdot)^\top y \;=\; (\partial f)^{-1}(-A\,\cdot) \tag{11}$$

is $(\|A\|/\ell)$-Lipschitz continuous. □

Proof: By Lemma 1 the mapping $(\partial f)^{-1}$ is $(1/\ell)$-Lipschitz continuous. The affine mapping $-A\,\cdot$ is $\|A\|$-Lipschitz continuous, hence the composed mapping $(\partial f)^{-1}(-A\,\cdot)$ is $(\|A\|/\ell)$-Lipschitz continuous. Equation (11) follows from the Fermat's rule [42, Theorem 16.2, Proposition 26.1], i.e., $0 \in \partial\left(f(\cdot) + (A\ z)^\top \cdot\right)(x^\star(z)) \in \partial f(x^\star(z)) + Az$, hence $-Az \in \partial f(x^\star(z))$ for all $z \in \mathbb{R}^n$; Equation (11) follows by applying $(\partial f)^{-1}$ to both sides of the last inclusion. ■

It follows from Lemma 2 that, for all $i \in \mathbb{N}[1,N]$, the optimal response from (5) reads as

$$x^{i\star}(\sigma,\, K\lambda) = (\partial f^i)^{-1}\left([-C,\, -K]\begin{bmatrix}\sigma\\ \lambda\end{bmatrix}\right), \tag{12}$$

and analogously, the mapping $x^{0\star}$ in (7) reads as

$$x^{0\star}(\sigma,\lambda) = (\partial f^0)^{-1}\left([-K,\, K]\begin{bmatrix}\sigma\\ \lambda\end{bmatrix}\right),$$

where $f^0(y) := \frac{1}{2}y^\top y + \delta_{\mathcal{S}}(y)$.

In view of Γ in (9), for all $i \in \mathbb{N}[1,N]$, let us define the mapping $\Gamma^i : \mathbb{R}^{2n} \to \mathbb{R}^{2n}$ as

$$\begin{aligned}\Gamma^i([\sigma;\lambda]) &:= -\begin{bmatrix} x^{i\star}(\sigma,\, K\lambda) \\ 2x^{i\star}(\sigma,\, K\lambda) - x^{0\star}(\sigma,\lambda)\end{bmatrix} = \\ &-\begin{bmatrix} I_n & \mathbf{0}_{n\times n} \\ 2I_n & -I_n\end{bmatrix}\begin{bmatrix}(\partial f^i)^{-1} & \mathbf{0}_{n\times n} \\ \mathbf{0}_{n\times n} & (\partial f^0)^{-1}\end{bmatrix}\left(\begin{bmatrix}-C & -K\\ -K & K\end{bmatrix}\begin{bmatrix}\sigma\\ \lambda\end{bmatrix}\right)\end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

so that $\Gamma(\cdot) = \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\Gamma^i(\cdot)$. Note that the mapping $\operatorname{diag}(\partial f^i,\, \partial f^0)$ is γ-strongly monotone with $\gamma := \min\{\ell, 1\}$, thus the mapping $\operatorname{diag}((\partial f^i)^{-1},\, (\partial f^0)^{-1})$ in (13) is γ-cocoercive and $(1/\gamma)$-Lipschitz continuous due to Lemma 1 and [42, Proposition 20.23]. In the reminder of the proof we exploit the following result, which is a variant of [42, Proposition 4.5].

Lemma 3: Let $\mathcal{M} : \mathbb{R}^m \to \mathbb{R}^m$ be a γ-cocoercive mapping, $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$, and $A, B \in \mathbb{R}^{m\times m}$ be invertible matrices. If $A^{-\top}B \in \mathbb{S}^m_{\succ 0}$, then the mapping $A\,\mathcal{M}\,(B\,\cdot)$ is η-cocoercive in $\mathcal{H}_{A^{-\top}B}$ with $\eta := \gamma/(\|A\|^2 \left\|A^{-\top}B\right\|)$. □

Proof: Since $\mathcal{M}$ is γ-cocoercive, for all $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^m$:

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\left(A\mathcal{M}(Bx) - A\mathcal{M}(By)\right)^\top A^{-\top}B(x-y)\\
&= \left(\mathcal{M}(Bx) - \mathcal{M}(By)\right)^\top B(x-y)\\
&\geq \gamma \left\|\mathcal{M}(Bx) - \mathcal{M}(By)\right\|^2\\
&\geq \frac{\gamma}{\|A\|^2}\left\|A\mathcal{M}(Bx) - A\mathcal{M}(By)\right\|^2\\
&\geq \frac{\gamma}{\|A\|^2\left\|A^{-\top}B\right\|}\left\|A\mathcal{M}(Bx) - A\mathcal{M}(By)\right\|^2_{A^{-\top}B}.
\end{aligned}
$$

■

We now apply Lemma 3 to the mapping $\Gamma^i(\cdot)$ in (13). Namely, we consider $m = 2n$ and the matrices

$$
A := -\begin{bmatrix} I_n & \mathbf{0}_{n\times n} \\ 2I_n & -I_n \end{bmatrix},\; B := \begin{bmatrix} -C & -K \\ -K & K \end{bmatrix}, \tag{14}
$$

and derive

$$
\begin{aligned}
P := A^{-\top}B &= -\begin{bmatrix} I & \mathbf{0} \\ 2I & -I \end{bmatrix}^{-\top}\begin{bmatrix} -C & -K \\ -K & K \end{bmatrix}\\
&= \begin{bmatrix} I & 2I \\ \mathbf{0} & -I \end{bmatrix}\begin{bmatrix} C & K \\ K & -K \end{bmatrix}\\
&= \begin{bmatrix} C+2K & -K \\ -K & K \end{bmatrix}\\
&= \begin{bmatrix} C+(1-\epsilon)K & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} 1+\epsilon & -1 \\ -1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}\otimes K,
\end{aligned}
$$

where $\epsilon > 0$ is chosen such that $C + (1-\epsilon)K \succcurlyeq 0$.

Since $\left[\begin{smallmatrix} 1+\epsilon & -1 \\ -1 & 1 \end{smallmatrix}\right] \succ 0$ and $C \in \mathbb{S}^n$, $K \succ 0$ and $C + K \succ 0$ ensure that B is invertible and $A^{-\top}B \succ 0$. By Lemma 3, this implies that, for all $i \in \mathbb{N}[1,N]$, $\Gamma^i(\cdot)$ is β-cocoercive in $\mathcal{H}_{A^{-\top}B}$, where $A^{-\top}B = P$ and $\ell/(\|A\|^2 \|P\|) = \ell/((3+2\sqrt{2})\|P\|) \geq \ell/(6\|P\|) =: \beta$ in (10). In turn, $\Gamma(\cdot) = \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^N \Gamma^i(\cdot)$ is also β-cocoercive [42, Example 4.31].

Next we show that all the mappings $\{\Gamma^i\}_{i=1}^N$ are strictly monotone in $\mathcal{H}_P$, which implies that Γ is strictly monotone as well [41, Exercise 12.4 (c)]. First, for all $i \in \mathbb{N}[1,N]$, $\operatorname{diag}\left((\partial f^i)^{-1}, (\partial f^0)^{-1}\right)$ in (13) is strictly monotone by Lemma 1 and [42, Proposition 20.23]. Finally, strict monotonicity of $\Gamma^i = A \operatorname{diag}\left((\partial f^i)^{-1}, (\partial f^0)^{-1}\right) \circ B$ follows from the next result, which is a variant of [42, Proposition 28.2].

Lemma 4: Let $\mathcal{M} : \mathbb{R}^m \to \mathbb{R}^m$ be a (strictly) monotone mapping, and $A, B \in \mathbb{R}^{m\times m}$. If A is invertible and $A^{-\top}B \in \mathbb{S}^m_{\succ 0}$, then the mapping $A\,\mathcal{M}(B\,\cdot)$ is (strictly) monotone in $\mathcal{H}_{A^{-\top}B}$. □

Proof: As $\mathcal{M}$ is (strictly) monotone, for all $x \neq y \in \mathbb{R}^m$:

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \leq (<)\ & \left(\mathcal{M}(Bx) - \mathcal{M}(By)\right)^\top (Bx - By) \\ &= \left(\mathcal{M}(Bx) - \mathcal{M}(By)\right)^\top A^\top A^{-\top} B\,(x-y) \\ &= \left(A\,\mathcal{M}(Bx) - A\,\mathcal{M}(By)\right)^\top A^{-\top} B\,(x-y)\,. \end{aligned}$$

■

VI. Discussion

A. Features of the dynamic control algorithm

One computational feature of the iteration in $(*)$ is that it only requires one-to-all coordination between a central controller and the decentralized, hence *parallelizable*, optimal responses $(x^{i\star})_{i=1}^N$ in (5) of the agents, as shown in Algorithm 1. Each decentralized computation consists in solving a finite dimensional strongly convex optimization problem, for which efficient algorithms are available [45], [47]. Note that at each iteration t only two vectors in $\mathbb{R}^n$ are broadcast, independently on the population size N, which can be arbitrarily large. Also note that the controller needs access to the aggregate information $\mathcal{A}$ only, not necessarily to the entire set of optimal responses. The main distinctive feature of the proposed architecture is that the central controller can decide on the step sizes $(\alpha_t)_{t=0}^\infty$ and ϵ, as well as on the stopping criterion for the

iteration in $(*)$. Therefore, the agents can simply behave as *fully noncooperative*, in the sense that in addition to being self-interested, they do not have to exchange information with each other, nor to agree on the step sizes associated with some coordination signal, nor on the stopping criterion. Each of these agreement points would be in fact exposed to malicious agent behavior. Finally note that, for the convergence of the dynamic interactions, neither the central controller nor the agents need to know the population size N.

B. Dynamic control as fixed point iteration

The iteration in $(*)$ reads as a fixed point iteration

$$\begin{bmatrix} \sigma_{(t+1)} \\ \lambda_{(t+1)} \end{bmatrix} = (1-\alpha_t) \begin{bmatrix} \sigma_{(t)} \\ \lambda_{(t)} \end{bmatrix} + \alpha_t \, \mathcal{T} \left(\begin{bmatrix} \sigma_{(t)} \\ \lambda_{(t)} \end{bmatrix} \right)$$

where $\mathcal{T}(\cdot) := (I + \epsilon\, M)^{-1} (\mathrm{Id} - \epsilon\, \Gamma)(\cdot)$. Note that a vector $\bar{u} \in \mathbb{R}^{2n}$ is a fixed point of the mapping $\mathcal{T}$ if and only if, for all $\alpha > 0$, it is fixed point of the mapping $(1-\alpha)\mathrm{Id} + \alpha\mathcal{T}$, and if and only if it is a zero of $M + \Gamma$. In fact, if $\bar{u} = (I + \epsilon\, M)^{-1} (\mathrm{Id} - \epsilon\, \Gamma)(\bar{u})$, then $(I + \epsilon\, M)\, \bar{u} = \bar{u} - \epsilon\, \Gamma(\bar{u})$, which is equivalent to $M\bar{u} + \Gamma(\bar{u}) = \mathbf{0}$. Next we discuss the regularity of $\mathcal{T}$. It follows from Lemma 1 that $\mathcal{T}$ is Lipschitz continuous. Specifically, $\mathcal{T}$ is nonexpansive, i.e., 1-Lipschitz continuous according to the following analysis. It follows from the proof of Theorem 3 that M in (9) is monotone in $\mathcal{H}_P$, with P as in (10), thus $(I + \epsilon M)^{-1}$ is firmly nonexpansive [42, Corollary 23.10 (i)]. According to Theorem 2, $\epsilon\, \Gamma$ is firmly nonexpansive, as well as the mapping $\mathrm{Id} - \epsilon\, \Gamma$ [42, Proposition 4.2]. Therefore, $\mathcal{T}$ is the composition of two firmly nonexpansive mappings, which implies that it is nonexpansive. Some fixed point iterations with global convergence guarantee are known for nonexpansive operators [48]. Among others, we mention the Krasnoselskij iteration [23, Equation (18)], [48, Theorem 3.2] and the Mann iteration [23, Equation (20)]. The former corresponds to the design choice $\alpha_t := \bar{\alpha} \in (0, 1)$ for all $t \in \mathbb{N}$, while the latter to choosing a sequence $(\alpha_t)_{t=0}^{\infty}$ such that $\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \alpha_t = \infty$, e.g. $\alpha_t := 1/(t+1)$.

VII. Applications

The aggregative game setup in Sections II–III is applicable to the dynamic management of noncooperative agents. Applications include network congestion control [13], demand response

in competitive markets [12] and demand side management for large populations of prosumers in the smart grid, e.g. residential loads with coupling constraints [3], [49], and smart homes with shared renewable energy sources [50]. The common feature of all these setups is in fact the presence of a population of competitive agents with convex cost functions, convex local and shared constraints, coupled together in aggregative form as in (1)–(2). In the next subsections we focus on two such applications.

A. Congestion control with network capacity constraints

We consider the problem faced by a network manager to control the flow demands of a large set of noncooperative users by dynamically pricing the network capacity [13].

General problem setup: The network is characterized by a set of edges $\mathcal{E} := \mathbb{N}[1, n]$, with capacity $\overline{c} := [\overline{c}_1; \ldots; \overline{c}_n] \in \mathbb{R}^n_{>0}$. Each user $i \in \mathbb{N}[1, N]$ aims at selecting its flow profile $x^i \in \mathbb{R}^n$ that minimizes its disutility function, that is coupled in aggregative form to the flow profiles of all other agents. Specifically, each user i aims at minimizing the cost function $J^i(x^i, \frac{1}{N}\sum_{j=1}^N x^j) + p^\top x^i$, that is

$$f^i\left(x^i\right) + \left(c\left(\tfrac{1}{N}\textstyle\sum_{j=1}^N x^j\right) + p\right)^\top x^i, \tag{15}$$

where [13, Sections III-IV] the function f^i, continuous and convex, represents the intrinsic disutility, the function $c(\cdot) = [c_1(\cdot); \ldots; c_n(\cdot)]^\top$ represents the flow-unit delay cost (disutility) experienced by the users over the edges, and $p \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is the congestion price, that is, the penalty vector associated with the shared network-capacity constraint

$$\mathbf{0}_n \leq \tfrac{1}{N}\textstyle\sum_{i=1}^N x^i \leq \overline{c}. \tag{16}$$

Each user i also has a local constraint set $\mathcal{X}^i$ that represents its individual routing policy per flow unit.

Illustrative scenario with fixed routing policy: In the following, we simulate the scenario illustrated in [13, Section IV.B], where fixed routing policies are considered. Namely, each agent i has a routing policy $x^i = a^i\xi^i$, for some scalar $\xi^i \geq 0$, and some fixed vector $a^i \in \mathbb{R}^n$ such that $\mathbf{0}_n \leq a^i \leq \mathbf{1}_n$. As in [13, Section IV.B], for each user i, we use the convex, non-quadratic, intrinsic disutility function $f^i(\xi^i) := -20\ln(1 + \xi^i)$.



Fig. 2: The pair $\left(\sigma_{(t)}, \lambda_{(t)}\right)$ generated as in $(*)$ converges to the zero $[\bar{\sigma}; \bar{\lambda}]$ of the mapping Θ in (8), hence $\sigma_{(t)}$, $\mathcal{A}(\sigma_{(t)}, \lambda_{(t)})$, and $x^{0\star}(\sigma_{(t)}, \lambda_{(t)})$ converge to $\bar{\sigma} = \mathcal{A}(\bar{\sigma}, \bar{\lambda}) \in \mathcal{S}$.

Affine approximation of the delay cost: Next we derive an affine approximation for the delay mapping $c(\cdot)$, which in [13, Section IV.B] reads as, for all $e \in \mathbb{N}[1, n]$, $c_e(\cdot) = 1/(\beta_e - N\cdot)$, for some $\beta_e > 0$. Here we replace the function $c_e(\cdot)$ with its first order Taylor approximation around the origin, that is, $c_e(\cdot) \simeq 1/\beta_e + (N/\beta_e^2)\,\cdot$. Therefore, in (15) we consider the delay cost mapping

$$c\,(\cdot) := \left[\text{diag}\left((N/\beta_e^2)_{e=1}^n\right)\right](\cdot) + \text{vec}\left((1/\beta_e)_{e=1}^n\right). \tag{17}$$

Note that the matrix $\text{diag}\left((N/\beta_e^2)_{e=1}^n\right) \succ 0$ corresponds to the matrix C in the cost function structure in (3), hence any matrix gain $K \succ 0$ satisfies the design choice 2.

Numerical simulations: We use the numerical parameters in [13, Tables I, II], that is, $n = 5$, $N = 4$, $\beta_1 = \ldots = \beta_n = 20$, $\bar{c}_1 = \ldots = \bar{c}_{n-1} = 18/N$, $\bar{c}_n = 15/N$, and vectors $a_1, \ldots, a_N$ as in [13, Table I, columns 3–7]. We tune the gains of the dynamic control law κ in $(*)$ as $\alpha = 0.99$, $K = 0.5 I_n$, and choose ϵ satisfying the design choice 3. Finally, we set as convergence criterion that both $\left\|\sigma_{(t)} - \mathcal{A}(\sigma_{(t)}, K\lambda_{(t)})\right\|$ and $\left\|x^{0\star}(\sigma_{(t)}), K\lambda_{(t)}) - \mathcal{A}(\sigma_{(t)}, K\lambda_{(t)})\right\|$ must be less than 10^{-2}. Figure 2 shows a representative converging scenario. Next we check the effect of the affine approximation of the delay cost mapping. First, we compute the pair $(\bar{\sigma}, \bar{\lambda})$ as limit point of $(*)$, with $c(\cdot)$ as in (17). Then, for each user i we consider the cost in (15) of its strategy $\bar{x}^i := x^{i\star}(\bar{\sigma}, \bar{\lambda})$ at convergence, with $c(\cdot)$ as in [13, Section IV.B], i.e., $\bar{J}^i := J^i(\bar{x}^i) + (K\bar{\lambda})^\top \bar{x}^i$;

we compare this cost against the best achievable value, having fixed the strategies of all the other agents and the penalty vector, i.e., $J^i_{\text{best}} := \min_{y \in \mathcal{X}^i} J^i(y, \frac{1}{N} y + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j \neq i}^N \bar{x}^j) + (K\bar{\lambda})^\top y$. Precisely, we compute the highest possible cost increase among all the users, relative to the best cost function value, i.e., $\varepsilon_{\text{rel}} := \max_{i \in \mathbb{N}[1,N]} |\bar{J}^i - J^i_{\text{best}}|/|J^i_{\text{best}}|$; as a result, we obtain a numerical value that is less than 0.02%.

B. Charging control for plug-in electric vehicles with transmission line constraints

We consider the problem to control the charging schedule of a large population of plug-in electric vehicles subject to transmission line constraints [51], [52].

Problem setup: Each user i aims at charging its vehicle with energy injections $[x^i_1, x^i_2, \dots, x^i_n] =: x^i$, while minimizing its individual disutility, subject to individual and shared charging constraints, over a charging horizon that is here discretized into $n = 14$ time intervals. The nominal values of the numerical parameters defining the cost functions and the charging constraints are taken from [53], and then are randomized as in [11] to emulate the population variability. For each PEV agent $i \in \mathbb{N}[1, N]$, we consider the quadratic cost function $J^i(x^i, \sigma) = q^i \, {x^i}^\top x^i + {c^i}^\top x^i + (a\,\sigma + b\mathbf{1}_n)^\top x^i$ that represents the battery degradation cost $q^i \, {x^i}^\top x^i + {c^i}^\top x^i$ [53, Section II.C], plus the electricity pricing $(a\,(\sigma + d) + b\mathbf{1}_n)^\top x^i$, where $a > 0$ represents the inverse of the price elasticity of demand, $b > 0$ represents the baseline price, and the vector $d \in \mathbb{R}^n$ the normalized average inflexible demand.

Numerical parameters: We set $q^i \sim \{0.005\} + [-0.001,\, 0.001]$, $c^i \sim \{0.075\} + [-0.01,\, 0.01]$ with uniform distribution. Further, we consider the normalized charging constraints $x^i \in \mathcal{U}^i := [\mathbf{0}_n, \overline{x}^i] \cap \left\{ y \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \mathbf{1}_n^\top y = \gamma^i \right\}$, where with uniform distribution $\gamma^i \sim \{1\} + [-0.1, 0.1]$, and the vector $\overline{x}^i \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is such that, for all $j \in \mathbb{N}[1, n]$, $\overline{x}^i_j \sim \{0, 0.2\}$, with $\overline{x}^i_j = 0$ (that is, no charging at the time interval j) with probability 20%. In addition, for 10% of the overall population, we consider the vehicle-to-grid option, namely by substituting the lower and upper bounds $[\mathbf{0}_n, \overline{x}^i]$ with $[-\frac{1}{2}\overline{x}^i, \overline{x}^i]$. Next we scale the parameters in [53, Section IV] with respect to the population size to derive the parameters $a = 0.038$, $b = 0.06\,\mathbf{1}_n$ of the pricing term, and d empirically from [8, Figure 1], [53, Figure 1].

Coupling constraints: We extend the setup in [11] with time-varying transmission line constraints, i.e., $\mathbf{0}_n \leq \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N x^i \leq \overline{c}$ as in (16) [51, Equation (13)], [52, Equation (1)], for some vector $\overline{c} \in \mathbb{R}^n_{\geq 0}$. We illustrate the proposed algorithm with capacities $\overline{c}_j = 0.04$ if



Fig. 3: Sum between the normalized average inflexible demand d and the average among the charging strategies $\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N} x^{i\star}(\bar{\sigma}, \bar{\lambda})$ at the equilibrium.

$j \in \{1, 2, 12, 13, 14\}$, 0.1 otherwise, which imposes special charging limitations in the first two and last three time intervals.

Numerical simulations: We tune the gains of the dynamic control law in $(*)$ as $\alpha = 0.99$, $K = 0.05 I_n$, and then choose ϵ according to the design choice 3. For randomly taken values of the parameters, Figure 3 shows the sum between the normalized average inflexible demand and the average among the charging strategies at the equilibrium, i.e., the optimal responses in (5). Figure 4 in log-log scale shows a representative converging scenario. Finally, we compute the relative difference between the best cost function value and the cost at the computed equilibrium $((x^{i\star}(\bar{\sigma}, \bar{\lambda}))_{i=1}^{N}, \bar{\lambda})$, i.e., $\varepsilon_{\text{rel}} := \max_{i \in \mathbb{N}[1,N]} |\bar{J}^i - J^i_{\text{best}}|/|J^i_{\text{best}}|$, where for all $i \in \mathbb{N}[1, N]$, $\bar{x}^i := x^{i\star}(\bar{\sigma}, \bar{\lambda})$, $\bar{J}^i := \min_{y \in \mathcal{X}^i} J^i(y, \bar{\sigma}) + (K\bar{\lambda})^\top y = J^i(\bar{x}^i, \bar{\sigma}) + (K\bar{\lambda})^\top \bar{x}^i$, and $J^i_{\text{best}} := \min_{y \in \mathcal{X}^i} J^i(y, \frac{1}{N} y + \frac{1}{N}\sum_{j \neq i} \bar{x}^j) + (K\bar{\lambda})^\top y$. Already for $N = 5$ we obtain a maximum relative difference ε_{rel} that is less than 0.03%.

VIII. Conclusion

We have addressed the problem to control a large population of competitive agents, with strongly convex cost functions coupled together via the average population state, convex local and coupling constraints, towards a competitive aggregative equilibrium. Our technical results allow us to design a model-free dynamic control law with global convergence guarantee, with



Fig. 4: The pair $\big(\sigma_{(t)}, \lambda_{(t)}\big)$ generated as in $(*)$ converges to the zero $[\bar{\sigma}; \bar{\lambda}]$ of the mapping Θ in (8), hence $\sigma_{(t)}$, $\mathcal{A}(\sigma_{(t)}, \lambda_{(t)})$, and $x^{0\star}(\sigma_{(t)}, \lambda_{(t)})$ converge to $\bar{\sigma} = \mathcal{A}(\bar{\sigma}, \bar{\lambda}) \in \mathcal{S}$.

no assumption on the problem data, other than strong convexity and compactness. The numerical simulations show that the proposed algorithm achieves an almost competitive aggregative equilibrium within a small number of iterations.

APPENDIX

A. *Proof of Proposition 1*

For any $\boldsymbol{\sigma} := \big[\sigma^1; \dots; \sigma^N\big] \in \mathbb{R}^{nN}$, we consider the optimization problem

$$\mathcal{P}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}): \begin{cases} \min\limits_{y^0, \boldsymbol{y}} & \tilde{J}^0(y^0) + \sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{J}^i\left(y^i, \boldsymbol{\sigma}\right) \\ \text{s.t.} & N\, y^0 - \sum_{j=1}^N y^j = 0 \end{cases} \tag{18}$$

where $y^0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $\boldsymbol{y} := [y^1; \dots; y^N] \in \mathbb{R}^{nN}$, $\tilde{J}^0 : \mathbb{R}^n \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ is a strongly convex function such that $\mathrm{dom}(\tilde{J}^0) = \mathcal{S}$, and for all $i \in \mathbb{N}[1, N]$, $\tilde{J}^i : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^{nN} \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ is defined as $\tilde{J}^i\left(y^i, \boldsymbol{\sigma}\right) := J^i(y^i, \frac{1}{N} y^i + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j \neq i}^N \sigma^j)$, thus $\mathrm{dom}(\tilde{J}^i) = \mathrm{dom}(J^i) = \mathcal{X}^i$ by Standing Assumption 2.

Let $[x^{\star 0}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}); \boldsymbol{x}^\star(\boldsymbol{\sigma})] = \big[x^{\star 0}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}); x^{\star 1}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}); \dots; x^{\star N}(\boldsymbol{\sigma})\big]$ be the optimizer of $\mathcal{P}(\boldsymbol{\sigma})$ in (18). Since the mapping $\boldsymbol{x}^\star(\cdot)$ takes values in the compact set $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{X}} := \mathcal{X}^1 \times \dots \times \mathcal{X}^N$ and is (Lipschitz) continuous by Lemma 2, it has at least one fixed point [54, Theorem 4.1.5 (b)]. In the reminder of the proof, let $\bar{\boldsymbol{\sigma}} = \boldsymbol{x}^\star(\bar{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}) \in \boldsymbol{\mathcal{X}}$ be a fixed point of $\boldsymbol{x}^\star$.

Since $\mathcal{P}(\bar{\boldsymbol{\sigma}})$ from (18) has a separable convex cost function and the linear coupling constraint $y^0 = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N y^i$, see [55, Equation 2.1], it can be solved via the dual decomposition method

[55, Section 2]. Specifically, the Lagrangian function

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L}\left(\boldsymbol{y},\lambda\right) :=\ & \tilde{J}(y^0)+\textstyle\sum_{i=1}^{N}\{\tilde{J}^i\left(y^i,\bar{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}\right)\}\\ & +\lambda^\top\left(-Ny^0+\textstyle\sum_{j=1}^{N}y^j\right)\\ =\ & \tilde{J}(y^0)-N\lambda^\top y^0+\textstyle\sum_{i=1}^{N}\tilde{J}^i\left(y^i,\bar{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}\right)+\lambda^\top y^i\end{aligned}$$

is separable, therefore, due to Standing Assumption 1 [47, Section 5.2.3], the iteration [55, Equations 2.4, 2.5]

$$x^0_{(t+1)} := \arg\min_{y\in\mathbb{R}^n}\tilde{J}^0\left(y\right)-N\lambda_{(t)}^\top y, \tag{19a}$$

$$x^i_{(t+1)} := \arg\min_{y\in\mathbb{R}^n}\tilde{J}^i\left(y,\bar{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}\right)+\lambda_{(t)}^\top y,\quad \forall i\in\{1,\dots,N\}, \tag{19b}$$

$$\lambda_{(t+1)} := \lambda_{(t)}+\epsilon_t\left(-Nx^0_{(t+1)}+\textstyle\sum_{i=1}^{N}x^i_{(t+1)}\right) \tag{19c}$$

converges to $(x^{\star 0}(\bar{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}),\boldsymbol{x}^\star(\bar{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}),\lambda^\star_{\bar{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}})$, for an opportune choice of the sequence $(\epsilon_t)_{t=0}^{\infty}$, where $[x^{\star 0}(\bar{\boldsymbol{\sigma}});\,\boldsymbol{x}^\star(\bar{\boldsymbol{\sigma}})]$ is the optimal solution to $\mathcal{P}(\bar{\boldsymbol{\sigma}})$. Moreover, by Slater's constraint qualification in Standing Assumption 1, there exists a unique optimal dual multiplier $\lambda^\star_{\bar{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}}\in\mathbb{R}^n$ [47, Section 5.2.3, p. 227].

We now define $\left[\bar{x}^1;\dots;\bar{x}^N\right] := \boldsymbol{x}^\star(\bar{\boldsymbol{\sigma}})$ and $\bar{p} := \lambda^\star_{\bar{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}}$, so that at convergence (i.e., as $t\to\infty$) by (19b) we have $\bar{x}^i = \arg\min_{y\in\mathcal{X}^i} J^i\left(y,\frac{1}{N}y+\frac{1}{N}\sum_{j\neq i}\bar{x}^j\right)+\bar{p}^\top y$ for all $i\in\mathbb{N}[1,N]$ by Equation (19b), and $\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\bar{x}^i = \boldsymbol{x}^{0\star}(\bar{\boldsymbol{\sigma}})\in\mathcal{S}$ by (19c). Thus by Definition 1 the pair $\left(\{\bar{x}^i\}_{i=1}^N,\,\bar{p}\right)$ is a competitive aggregative equilibrium for the game in (2) with shared constraint in (1). ■

B. Proof of Proposition 2

Similarly to the proof of Proposition 1, for any $\sigma\in\mathcal{S}$, we consider the optimization problem

$$\mathcal{P}(\sigma):\ \begin{cases}\min\limits_{y^0,\,\boldsymbol{y}} & J^0\left(y^0,\sigma\right)+\sum_{i=1}^{N}J^i\left(y^i,\sigma\right)\\ \text{s.t.} & N\,y^0-\sum_{j=1}^{N}y^j=0\end{cases} \tag{20}$$

where $y^0\in\mathbb{R}^n$, $\boldsymbol{y}:=[y^1;\dots;y^N]\in\mathbb{R}^{nN}$, $J^0:\mathbb{R}^n\times\mathbb{R}^n\to\mathbb{R}$ is defined as $J^0(y,\sigma):=N\frac{1}{2}y^\top y+N\sigma^\top y+\delta_{\mathcal{S}}(y)$, and for all $i\in\mathbb{N}[1,N]$, J^i is as in (3), hence $\mathrm{dom}(J^i)=\mathcal{X}^i$.

Let $[x^{\star 0}(\sigma);\,\boldsymbol{x}^\star(\sigma)]=\left[x^{\star 0}(\sigma);\,x^{\star 1}(\sigma);\dots;\,x^{\star N}(\sigma)\right]$ be the optimizer of $\mathcal{P}(\sigma)$ in (20), and consider the optimal aggregation mapping $\mathcal{A}^\star:\mathbb{R}^n\to\mathbb{R}^n$ as

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{A}^\star(\sigma) :=\ & \tfrac{1}{N}\textstyle\sum_{i=1}^{N}x^{\star i}(\sigma)=\tfrac{1}{N}\left(\mathbf{1}_N^\top\otimes I_n\right)\boldsymbol{x}^\star(\sigma)\\ =\ & \tfrac{1}{N}\left(\left[0,\mathbf{1}_N^\top\right]\otimes I_n\right)\left[x^{\star 0}(\sigma);\,\boldsymbol{x}^\star(\sigma)\right].\end{aligned} \tag{21}$$

It follows from Lemma 2 that $\sigma \mapsto [x^{\star 0}(\sigma);\, \boldsymbol{x}^\star(\sigma)]$ is (Lipschitz) continuous, thus $\mathcal{A}^\star$ in (21) is continuous as well. By definition, $\mathcal{A}^\star$ takes values in the compact set $\mathcal{S}$, hence it has at least one fixed point [54, Theorem 4.1.5 (b)]. In the reminder, let $\bar{\sigma} = \mathcal{A}^\star(\bar{\sigma}) \in \mathcal{S}$ be a fixed point of $\mathcal{A}^\star$ in (21).

Since $\mathcal{P}(\bar{\sigma})$ from (20) has a separable convex cost function and the linear coupling constraint $y^0 = \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^N x^i$, it can be solved via the dual decomposition method. Specifically, the Lagrangian function

$$\mathcal{L}\left(\boldsymbol{y}, \lambda\right) := \sum_{i=0}^N \{J^i\left(y^i, \bar{\sigma}\right)\} + \lambda^\top \left(-Ny^0 + \sum_{j=1}^N y^j\right)$$

is separable, therefore, due to Standing Assumption 1 [47, Section 5.2.3], the iteration [55, Equations 2.4, 2.5]

$$x^0_{(t+1)} := \arg\min_{y \in \mathbb{R}^n} \tilde{J}^0\left(y, \bar{\sigma}\right) - N\lambda_{(t)}^\top y, \tag{22a}$$

$$x^i_{(t+1)} := \arg\min_{y \in \mathbb{R}^n} \tilde{J}^i\left(y, \bar{\sigma}\right) + \lambda_{(t)}^\top y, \quad \forall i \in \{1, \dots, N\}, \tag{22b}$$

$$\lambda_{(t+1)} := \lambda_{(t)} + \epsilon_t \left(-Nx^0_{(t+1)} + \sum_{i=1}^N x^i_{(t+1)}\right) \tag{22c}$$

converges to $(x^{\star 0}(\bar{\sigma}), \boldsymbol{x}^\star(\bar{\sigma}), \lambda^\star_{\bar{\sigma}})$, for an opportune choice of the sequence $(\epsilon_t)_{t=0}^\infty$, where $(x^{\star 0}(\bar{\sigma}), \boldsymbol{x}^\star(\bar{\sigma}))$ is the optimal solution to $\mathcal{P}(\bar{\sigma})$. Moreover, by Slater's constraint qualification in Standing Assumption 1, there exists a unique optimal dual multiplier $\lambda^\star_{\bar{\sigma}} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ [47, Section 5.2.3, p. 227]. Therefore, since $\bar{\sigma} = \mathcal{A}^\star(\bar{\sigma}) \in \mathcal{S}$, we have that

$$x^{\star 0}(\bar{\sigma}) = \arg\min_{y \in \mathcal{S}} J^0\left(y, \bar{\sigma}\right) - N{\lambda^\star_{\bar{\sigma}}}^\top y \tag{23a}$$

$$= \arg\min_{y \in \mathcal{S}} \frac{1}{2} y^\top y + \bar{\sigma}^\top y - \left(\lambda^\star_{\bar{\sigma}}\right)^\top y, \tag{23b}$$

$$x^{\star i}(\bar{\sigma}) = \arg\min_{y \in \mathcal{X}^i} J^i\left(y, \bar{\sigma}\right) + {\lambda^\star_{\bar{\sigma}}}^\top y, \quad i = 1, \dots, N, \tag{23c}$$

$$x^{\star 0}(\bar{\sigma}) = \tfrac{1}{N}\textstyle\sum_{i=1}^N x^{\star i}(\bar{\sigma}) = \mathcal{A}^\star(\bar{\sigma}) = \bar{\sigma}. \tag{23d}$$

Finally we note that, for all $i \in \mathbb{N}[1, N]$, the optimal response mapping $x^{i\star}$ in (5) is such that $x^{i\star}\left(\bar{\sigma}, \lambda^\star_{\bar{\sigma}}\right) = x^{\star i}(\bar{\sigma})$. Therefore, by the definition of the aggregation mappings $\mathcal{A}$ in (6) and $\mathcal{A}^\star$ in (23d), we have that $\mathcal{A}\left(\bar{\sigma}, \lambda^\star_{\bar{\sigma}}\right) = \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^N x^{i\star}\left(\bar{\sigma}, \lambda^\star_{\bar{\sigma}}\right) = \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^N x^{\star i}(\bar{\sigma}) = \mathcal{A}^\star(\bar{\sigma}) = \bar{\sigma} \in \mathcal{S}$. The proof hence follows with $\bar{\lambda} := \lambda^\star_{\bar{\sigma}}$. ■

C. Proof of Theorem 1

We first show that, for any given $\bar{\lambda} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, the set of optimal responses $(x^{i\star}(\bar{\sigma}, \bar{\lambda}))_{i=1}^N$ to $\left(\bar{\sigma}, \bar{\lambda}\right)$ such that $\bar{\sigma} = \mathcal{A}\left(\bar{\sigma}, \bar{\lambda}\right)$ gets arbitrarily close to a set of best responses.

Lemma 5: Let $\bar{\lambda} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, assume that for all $i \in \mathbb{N}[1, N]$, $\bar{x}^i := x^{i\star}(\bar{\sigma}, \bar{\lambda})$ as in (5), where $\bar{\sigma} := \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^N \bar{x}^i$, and define the best response

$$\bar{x}^{i,N}_{\text{best}} := \operatorname*{arg\,min}_{y \in \mathcal{X}^i} J^i\left(y, \tfrac{1}{N}y + \tfrac{1}{N}\textstyle\sum_{j\neq i}^N \bar{x}^j\right) + \bar{\lambda}^\top y$$

as in (2). Then $\exists\, c \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ such that $\max\limits_{i\in\mathbb{N}[1,N]} \left\|\bar{x}^i - \bar{x}^{i,N}_{\text{best}}\right\| \leq \frac{c}{N}$ for all $N \in \mathbb{N}$. □

Proof: It follows from Lemma 2 that we have to show that, for all $i \in \mathbb{N}[1, N]$, $\bar{x}^i = (\partial f^i)^{-1}\left(-C\bar{\sigma} - \bar{\lambda}\right)$, where $\bar{\sigma} := \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^N \bar{x}^i$, is $\mathcal{O}(1/N)$ distant from $\bar{x}^{i,N}_{\text{best}}$, which according to (2) and Lemma 2 reads as $\left(\partial f^i + \frac{2}{N}C\,\mathrm{Id}\right)^{-1}\left(-C(\bar{\sigma} - \frac{1}{N}\bar{x}^i) - \bar{\lambda}\right)$. Let us introduce the shorthand notation $v := -C\bar{\sigma} - \bar{\lambda}$ and $v^i_N := -C(\bar{\sigma} - \frac{1}{N}\bar{x}^i) - \bar{\lambda}$, where $\|v - v^i_N\| = \left\|\frac{1}{N}C\bar{x}^i\right\| \leq \frac{1}{N}\|C\|\max_{x\in\mathcal{X}}\|x\| =: \frac{1}{N}\|C\|\,c_{\mathcal{X}}$. We now exploit that fact that $(\partial f^i)^{-1}$ is $(1/\ell)$-Lipschitz continuous by Lemma 1, and that $\operatorname{rge}(\left(\partial f^i + \frac{2}{N}C\mathrm{Id}\right)^{-1}) \subseteq \mathcal{X}^i \subseteq \mathcal{X}$:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\|(\partial f^i)^{-1} - \left(\partial f^i + \tfrac{2}{N}C\,\mathrm{Id}\right)^{-1}\right\| \\
&\leq \left\|(\partial f^i)^{-1} \circ \left(\partial f^i + \tfrac{2}{N}C\,\mathrm{Id}\right) - \mathrm{Id}\right\| \cdot \left\|\left(\partial f^i + \tfrac{2}{N}C\,\mathrm{Id}\right)^{-1}\right\| \\
&\leq c_{\mathcal{X}}\left\|(\partial f^i)^{-1} \circ \left(\partial f^i + \tfrac{2}{N}C\,\mathrm{Id}\right) - (\partial f^i)^{-1} \circ (\partial f^i)\right\| \\
&\leq \tfrac{c_{\mathcal{X}}}{\ell}\left\|\tfrac{2}{N}C\,\mathrm{Id}\right\| \leq \tfrac{2\|C\|c_{\mathcal{X}}}{\ell}\tfrac{1}{N}.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, for all i, we derive that

$$\left\|\bar{x}^i - \bar{x}^{i,N}_{\text{best}}\right\| \leq \left\|(\partial f^i)^{-1}(v) - (\partial f^i)^{-1}(v^i_N)\right\| + \left\|(\partial f^i)^{-1}(v^i_N) - \left(\partial f + \tfrac{1}{N}C\,\mathrm{Id}\right)^{-1}(v^i_N)\right\| \leq \tfrac{c}{N}$$

for $c := (3\|C\|\,c_{\mathcal{X}})/\ell$. ■

We can now take an arbitrary $i \in \mathbb{N}[1, N]$ and consider the function J^i.
Since $\lim_{N\to\infty}\left\|\bar{x}^{i,N}_{\text{best}} - \bar{x}^i\right\| = 0$ by Lemma 5, due to the continuity of f^i on $\operatorname{dom}(f^i)$ we have that $|J^i(\bar{x}^i, \frac{1}{N}\sum_{j=1}^N \bar{x}^j) - J^i(\bar{x}^{i,N}_{\text{best}}, \frac{1}{N}\bar{x}^{i,N}_{\text{best}} + \frac{1}{N}\sum_{j\neq i}^N \bar{x}^j)| \to 0$ as $N \to \infty$.

If, in addition, the functions $\{f^i\}_{i=1}^N$ are Lipschitz continuous, then $\{J^i\}_{i=1}^N$ in (2) are Lipschitz continuous as well, and the following inequalities hold:

$$\begin{aligned}
&|J^i(\bar{x}^i, \tfrac{1}{N}\textstyle\sum_{j=1}^N \bar{x}^j) - J^i(\bar{x}^{i,N}_{\text{best}}, \tfrac{1}{N}\bar{x}^{i,N}_{\text{best}} + \tfrac{1}{N}\textstyle\sum_{j\neq i}^N \bar{x}^j)| \\
&\leq c_1 \left\|\bar{x}^i - \bar{x}^{i,N}_{\text{best}}\right\| + c_2 \left\|\tfrac{1}{N}\left(\bar{x}^i - \bar{x}^{i,N}_{\text{best}}\right)\right\| \\
&\leq \left(c_1 + \tfrac{c_2}{N}\right)\tfrac{c}{N} = \mathcal{O}\left(1/N\right),
\end{aligned}$$

for some $c_1, c_2 > 0$, due to Lemma 5. ■

REFERENCES

[1] A.-H. Mohsenian-Rad, V. Wong, J. Jatskevich, R. Schober, and A. Leon-Garcia, "Autonomous demand-side management based on game-theoretic energy consumption scheduling for the future smart grid," *IEEE Trans. on Smart Grid*, vol. 1, no. 3, pp. 320–331, 2010.

[2] W. Saad, Z. Han, H. Poor, and T. Başar, "Game theoretic methods for the smart grid," *IEEE Signal Processing Magazine*, pp. 86–105, 2012.

[3] R. Deng, Z. Yang, J. Chen, N. Asr, and M.-Y. Chow, "Residential energy consumption scheduling: A coupled-constraint game approach," *IEEE Trans. on Smart Grid*, vol. 5, no. 3, pp. 1340–1350, 2014.

[4] H. Chen, Y. Li, R. Louie, and B. Vucetic, "Autonomous demand side management based on energy consumption scheduling and instantaneous load billing: An aggregative game approach," *IEEE Trans. on Smart Grid*, vol. 5, no. 4, pp. 1744–1754, 2014.

[5] K. Ma, G. Hu, and C. Spanos, "Distributed energy consumption control via real-time pricing feedback in smart grid," *IEEE Trans. on Control Systems Technology*, vol. 22, no. 5, pp. 1907–1914, 2014.

[6] F. Bagagiolo and D. Bauso, "Mean-field games and dynamic demand management in power grids," *Dynamic Games and Applications*, vol. 4, no. 2, pp. 155–176, 2014.

[7] S. Li, W. Zhang, J. Lian, and K. Kalsi, "Market-based coordination of thermostatically controlled loads - Part I: A mechanism design formulation," *IEEE Trans. on Power Systems*, vol. 31, no. 2, pp. 1170–1178, 2016.

[8] Z. Ma, D. Callaway, and I. Hiskens, "Decentralized charging control of large populations of plug-in electric vehicles," *IEEE Trans. on Control Systems Technology*, vol. 21, no. 1, pp. 67–78, 2013.

[9] F. Parise, M. Colombino, S. Grammatico, and J. Lygeros, "Mean field constrained charging policy for large populations of plug-in electric vehicles," in *Proc. of the IEEE Conference on Decision and Control*, Los Angeles, California, USA, 2014, pp. 5101–5106.

[10] Z. Ma, S. Zou, L. Ran, X. Shi, and I. Hiskens, "Efficient decentralized coordination of large-scale plug-in electric vehicle charging," *Automatica*, vol. 69, pp. 35–47, 2016.

[11] S. Grammatico, "Exponentially convergent decentralized charging control for large populations of plug-in electric vehicles," *Proc. of the IEEE Conf. on Decision and Control*, 2016.

[12] N. Li, L. Chen, and M. A. Dahleh, "Demand response using linear supply function bidding," *IEEE Trans. on Smart Grid*, vol. 6, no. 4, pp. 1827–1838, 2015.

[13] J. Barrera and A. Garcia, "Dynamic incentives for congestion control," *IEEE Trans. on Automatic Control*, vol. 60, no. 2, pp. 299–310, 2015.

[14] T. Başar and G. Olsder, *Dynamic Noncooperative Game Theory*. SIAM, 1995.

[15] N. Nisan, T. Roughgarden, E. Tardos, and V. Vazirani, *Algorithmic Game Theory*. Cambridge University Press, 2007.

[16] N. S. Kukushkin, "Best response dynamics in finite games with additive aggregation," *Games and Economic Behavior*, vol. 48, pp. 94–10, 2004.

[17] P. Dubey, O. Haimanko, and A. Zapechelnyuk, "Strategic complements and substitutes, and potential games," *Games and Economic Behavior*, vol. 54, pp. 77–94, 2006.

[18] M. Dindos and C. Mezzetti, "Better-reply dynamics and global convergence to Nash equilibrium in aggregative games," *Games and Economic Behavior*, vol. 54, pp. 261–292, 2006.

[19] M. Jensen, "Aggregative games and best-reply potentials," *Economic Theory, Springer*, vol. 43, pp. 45–66, 2010.

[20] D. Bauso and R. Pesenti, "Mean field linear quadratic games with set up costs," *Dynamic Games and Applications*, vol. 3, pp. 89–104, 2013.

[21] M. Huang, P. Caines, and R. Malhamé, "Large-population cost-coupled LQG problems with nonuniform agents: Individual-mass behavior and decentralized ε-Nash equilibria," *IEEE Trans. on Automatic Control*, vol. 52, no. 9, pp. 1560–1571, 2007.

[22] S. Grammatico, F. Parise, and J. Lygeros, "Constrained linear quadratic deterministic mean field control: Decentralized convergence to Nash equilibria in large populations of heterogeneous agents," *Proc. of the IEEE Conf. on Decision and Control*, pp. 4412–4417, 2015.

[23] S. Grammatico, F. Parise, M. Colombino, and J. Lygeros, "Decentralized convergence to Nash equilibria in constrained deterministic mean field control," *IEEE Trans. on Automatic Control* (`http://dx.doi.org/10.1109/TAC.2015.2513368`), 2016.

[24] K. Arrow and G. Debreu, "Existence of an equilibrium for a competitive economy," *Econometrica*, vol. 22, no. 3, pp. 265–290, 1954.

[25] J. Rosen, "Existence and uniqueness of equilibrium points for concave n-person games," *Econometrica*, vol. 33, pp. 520–534, 1965.

[26] F. Facchinei and J. Pang, *Finite-dimensional variational inequalities and complementarity problems*. Springer Verlag, 2003.

[27] F. Facchinei and C. Kanzow, "Generalized Nash equilibrium problems," *A Quarterly Journal of Operations Research, Springer*, vol. 5, pp. 173–210, 2007.

[28] L. Pavel, "An extension of duality to a game-theoretic framework," *Automatica*, vol. 43, pp. 226–237, 2007.

[29] H. Yin, U. Shanbhag, and P. Mehta, "Nash equilibrium problems with scaled congestion costs and shared constraints," *IEEE Trans. on Automatic Control*, vol. 56, no. 7, pp. 1702–1708, 2011.

[30] A. Kulkarni and U. Shanbhag, "On the variational equilibrium as a refinement of the generalized Nash equilibrium," *Automatica*, vol. 48, pp. 45–55, 2012.

[31] G. Arslan, M. Demirkol, and S. Yüksel, "On games with coupled constraints," *IEEE Trans. on Automatic Control*, vol. 60, no. 2, pp. 358–372, 2015.

[32] S. Uryasev and R. Rubinstein, "On relaxation algorithms in computation of non-cooperative equilibria," *IEEE Trans. on Automatic Control*, vol. 39, no. 6, pp. 1263–1267, 1994.

[33] J. Marden, G. Arslan, and J. Shamma, "Joint strategy fictitious play with inertia for potential games," *IEEE Trans. on Automatic Control*, vol. 54, no. 2, pp. 208–220, 2009.

[34] J. S. Shamma and G. Arslan, "Dynamic fictitious play, dynamic gradient play, and distributed convergence to Nash equilibria," *IEEE Trans. on Automatic Control*, vol. 50, no. 3, pp. 312–327, 2005.

[35] A. Cortés and S. Martínez, "Self-triggered best-response dynamics for continuous games," *IEEE Trans. on Automatic Control*, vol. 60, no. 4, pp. 1115–1120, 2015.

[36] M. Zhu and E. Frazzoli, "On distributed equilibrium seeking for generalized convex games," *Proc. of the IEEE Conf. on Decision and Control*, pp. 4858–4863, 2012.

[37] J. Koshal, A. Nedić, and U. Shanbhag, "A gossip algorithm for aggregative games on graphs," *Proc. of the IEEE Conf. on Decision and Control*, pp. 4840–4845, 2012.

[38] F. Parise, B. Gentile, S. Grammatico, and J. Lygeros, "Network aggregative games: Distributed convergence to Nash equilibria," *Proc. of the IEEE Conference on Decision and Control, Osaka, Japan*, pp. 2295–2300, 2015.

[39] M. Zhu and E. Frazzoli, "Distributed robust adaptive equilibrium computation for generalized convex games," *Automatica*, vol. 63, pp. 82–91, 2016.

[40] J. Koshal, A. Nedić, and U. Shanbhag, "Distributed algorithms for aggregative games on graphs," *Operations Research*, vol. 64, no. 3, pp. 680–704, 2016.

[41] R.T. Rockafellar and R.J.B. Wets, *Variational Analysis*. Springer, 1998.

[42] H. H. Bauschke and P. L. Combettes, *Convex analysis and monotone operator theory in Hilbert spaces*. Springer, 2010.

[43] S. Grammatico, "Aggregative control of large populations of noncooperative agents," *Proc. of the IEEE Conf. on Decision and Control*, 2016.

[44] ——, "Aggregative control of competitive agents with coupled quadratic costs and shared constraints," *Proc. of the IEEE Conf. on Decision and Control*, 2016.

[45] D. P. Bertsekas, *Nonlinear programming*. Athena Scientific, 2004.

[46] P. Combettes, "Fejér monotonicity in convex optimization," in *Encyclopedia of Optimization*. Springer, 2000.

[47] S. Boyd and L. Vandenberghe, *Convex Optimization*. Cambridge University Press, 2009.

[48] V. Berinde, *Iterative Approximation of Fixed Points*. Springer, 2007.

[49] R. Deng, G. Xiao, R. Lu, and J. Chen, "Fast distributed demand response with spatially- and temporally-coupled constraints in smart grid," *IEEE Trans. on Smart Grid*, vol. 11, no. 6, pp. 1597–1606, 2015.

[50] R. Carli and M. Dotoli, "A decentralized resource allocation approach for sharing renewable energy among interconnected smart homes," *Proc. of the IEEE Conf. on Decision and Control*, pp. 5903–5908, 2015.

[51] A. Ghavami, K. Kar, S. Bhattacharya, and A. Gupta, "Price-driven charging of plug-in electric vehicles: Nash equilibrium, social optimality and best-response convergence," in *Proc. of the Conference on Information Sciences and Systems*, 2013.

[52] W. Tushar, W. Saad, H. Poor, and D. Smith, "Economics of electric vehicle charging: A game theoretic approach," *IEEE Trans. on Smart Grid*, vol. 3, no. 4, pp. 1767–1778, 2012.

[53] Z. Ma, S. Zou, and X. Liu, "A distributed charging coordination for large-scale plug-in electric vehicles considering battery degradation cost," *IEEE Trans. on Control Systems Technology*, vol. 23, no. 5, pp. 2044–2052, 2015.

[54] D. R. Smart, *Fixed point theorems*. Cambridge University Press Archive, 1974.

[55] S. Boyd, N. Parikh, E. Chu, B. Peleato, and J. Eckstein, "Distributed optimization and statistical learning via the alternating direction method of multipliers," *Foundations and Trends in Machine Learning*, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 1–122, 2010.